



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,088	09/22/2003	Takanori Kamoto	1114-189	6085

23117 7590 09/21/2006

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

FAISON GEE, VERONICA FAYE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1755

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/665,088

Applicant(s)

KAMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Veronica Faison-Gee

Art Unit

1755

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4-7-05.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 54-96 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 71-74 and 93-96 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 54-70 and 75-92 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

In the restriction set forth in the first office action mailed 09/23/2004, claims 20-25 and 50-53, drawn to the print head were non-elected without traverse. The response to the non-final rejection, filed 12/23/2004, cancelled original claims 1-53 and added claims 54-96. In response, a new restriction requirement was made. In view of the applicant's remarks filed 04/07/05 and a new consideration of claims 54-96, claims 71-74, and 93-96, drawn to a print head, are held as non-elected by original presentation. Claims 54-70 and 75-92, are now pending and treated on the merits below.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 70 and 92 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 21, 22, 47 and 48 of copending Application No. 10/713,226. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both ink composition

Art Unit: 1755

disclose dynamic surface tension and static surface tension wherein the difference between the two surface tension overlap (i.e in 10/665,088 the difference is represented by $0 \leq [\text{dynamic surface tension (mN/m)}] - [\text{static surface tension (mN/m)}] \leq 7 \text{ (mN/m)}$ and in 10/713,226 the difference is $0 \text{ mN/m} \leq dl \leq 15 \text{ mN/m}$ wherein dl is difference between dynamic surface tension and static surface tension).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 66, 67, 88 and 92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 66, 67, 88 and 92 recite wherein the ink composition comprises a yellow pigment, a magenta pigment and a cyan pigment. It is unclear to the Examiner with Applicant intended this to be a mixture of pigment or a Markush group. Please clarify.

For the purpose of examining the Examiner is interpreting the listed pigments as a Markush group.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 1755

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 54-58, 60-69, 75, 77-80, and 82-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kato (US Patent 6,440,203).

Kato teaches an ink composition comprising a first colorant, a second colorant, a penetrating agent, water and a water-soluble organic solvent. The first colorant is a pigment which is dispersible and/or dissolvable in water without any dispersant (abstract and col. 2 lines 32-45). The reference also teaches that any pigment can be used (col. 2 lines 64-65). Pigments such as carbon black, Pigment Yellow 74, 138, 150 and 180, Pigment Red 122 and 202, Pigment Blue 15:3 and 15:4 may be present in the ink composition in the amount of 0.1 to 10 percent by weight (col. 3 lines 31-56). The penetrating agent include glycol ether and/or acetylene glycol surfactants, wherein the glycol ether is present in the amount of 1 to 20 percent by weight and the acetylene glycol is present in the amount of 0.1 to 10 percent by weight (col. 7 line 51-col. 8 line 44). The ink composition has a surface tension of about 25 to 50 mN/m (col. 8 lines 45-47). The aqueous solvent comprises water and a water-soluble organic solvent (col. 8 lines 52-53). The ink may further comprise a wetting agent including ethylene glycol, diethylene glycol, and alkyl ether of polyhydric alcohols present in the amount of 1 to 40 percent by weight (col. 9 lines 4-25). The reference also teaches that an ink set comprising a black, cyan, magenta and yellow inks (col. 10 lines 51+). The composition as taught by Kato appears to anticipate the claimed invention.

Claim 76 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lauw (US Patent 5,534,051).

Art Unit: 1755

Lauw teaches a specific dye set used for thermal ink jet printing comprising Direct Blue 199 and Acid Blue 9, Reactive Red 180 and Acid Red 52 and Acid Yellow 23 (abstract and col. 2 line 37-col. 3 line 6). The cyan, magenta, and yellow ink composition comprises 0.1 to 4 percent by weight of at least one dye, about 3 to 20 percent by weight of at least one diol, 0 to 5 percent by weight of at least one glycol ether, about 3 to 9 percent by weight of 2-pyrrolidone, about 0.5 to 5 percent by weight of at least one component selected from the group consisting of surfactants, buffers and biocides, about 3 to 11 percent by weight of at least one inorganic salt and the balance water (col. 3 lines 53-61). The reference further teaches that the surfactant may be an alcohol ethoxylates nonionic surfactants such as Tergitol 15-S-15 (col. 5 lines 2-43). The composition as taught by Lauw appears to anticipate the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 1755

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 54-62, 64, 65, 68, 69, 75, 77-34, 86, 87, 90 and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yatake (US Patent 5,746,818).

Yatake teaches an ink composition comprising a pigment dispersible and/or soluble in water without the aid of any dispersant and a glycol ether selected from the group consisting of diethylene glycol mono-n-butyl ether, triethylene glycol mono-n-butyl ether, propylene glycol mono-n-butyl ether and dipropylene glycol mono-n-butyl ether (abstract and col. 2 lines 28-35). The reference also teaches a recording apparatus comprising a recording head is provided independently of an ink tank and an ink composition (col. 2 lines 48-50). The reference teaches that the glycol ether can effectively inhibit the bleeding or feathering, realizing a high-quality image (col. 2 lines 12-14). The pigment may be subjected to surface treatment to bond at least one function group selected from carbonyl, carboxyl, hydroxyl and sulfonyl groups or a salt thereof, wherein the pigment may be carbon black (col. 3 lines 22-32) and present in the amount of 2 to 15 percent by weight (col. 3 lines 60-61). The glycol ether may be present in the amount of 3 to 30 percent by weight (col. 4 lines 16-19). The reference further teaches components such as 1,5-pentane diol and surfactants are added to improve the solubility of the ink composition (col. 4 lines 20-35). The ink contains acetylene glycol surfactant including Surfynol 104, 82, 465, 485 and TG are present in the ink composition in the amount of 0.5 to 1.5 percent by weight (col. 4 lines 28-37). The reference remains silent to the ink properties set forth in claim 1. However it is the

Art Unit: 1755

position of the Examiner that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the ink composition as taught by Yatake would have similar properties as claimed by Applicant absent evidence to the contrary.

Claims 54-62, 64-69, 75-84, 86-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi (US Patent 6,500,248).

Hayashi teaches an ink composition comprising a pigment, a 1,2-alkanediol, glycerin, a polyhydric alcohol derivative and/or an acetylene glycol surfactant, a water-soluble organic solvent, and water. The reference further teaches that the ink composition has a surface tension of not more than 40 mNm⁻¹ at 20°C wherein the ink can provide good print quality and can realize continuous printing (abstract and col. 2 lines 47-60). The colorant may be an inorganic or organic pigment without particular limitations. The pigment may be subjected to surface treatment to attach at least one function group selected from carbonyl, carboxyl, hydroxyl and sulfonyl groups or a salt thereof (col. 4 lines 19-43). The pigment may be added to the ink composition in the amount of 0.5 to 15 percent by weight (col. 5 lines 7-9). The polyhydric alcohol may include diethylene glycol mono-n-butyl ether, triethylene glycol mono-n-butyl ether, propylene glycol mono-n-butyl ether and dipropylene glycol mono-n-butyl ether which may be used alone or in combination in the amount of 3 to 30 percent by weight (col. 5 lines 19-33). The acetylene glycol surfactant is added in the amount of about 0.1 to 3 percent by weight (col. 5 line 42-6 line 10). The ink composition comprises a water-soluble organic solvent and water as the main solvent. The water-soluble organic solvent may be ethylene glycol, diethylene glycol, triethylene glycol, dipropylene glycol,

Art Unit: 1755

and 1,5-pentanediol are present in the amount 1 to 30 percent by weight (col. 6 lines 25-45). The reference further teaches that an ink composition containing a pigment wherein the ink is delivered from the front face of the nozzle can stir the ink permitting the ink to be stably ejected. This can be achieved by pressurizing the ink, by means of pressurizing means for ejecting the ink (col. 10 line 66-col. 11 line 7). The reference remains silent to the ink properties set forth in claim 1. However it is the position of the Examiner that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the ink composition as taught by Yatake would have similar properties as claimed by Applicant absence evidence to the contrary.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Veronica Faison-Gee whose telephone number is 571-272-1366. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays 8 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571-272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1755

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

vfg
9-18-06


J. A. CORENGO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER